

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

09/674,962

Examiner

T. D. Wessendorf

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

HAUER ET AL.

Art Unit

1639



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,962	11/08/2000	Bernhard Hauer	49041	7018

26474 7590 07/24/2007
NOVAK DRUCE DELUCA & QUIGG, LLP
1300 EYE STREET NW
SUITE 1000 WEST TOWER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

WESSENDORF, TERESA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1639

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/674,962

Applicant(s)

HAUER ET AL.

Examiner

T. D. Wessendorf

Art Unit

1639

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): none.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, ~~the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.~~
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 5-8.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

T. D. Wessendorf
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1639

7/10/07

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the last Office action. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Page 4, lines 19-26 relied upon by applicants to show that the other amino acid positions as being essential simply recites the amino acid residues that are advantageous and not essential as the motif HxxH. Thus, to pick and choose from the only 20 naturally occurring amino acid residues that can advantageously replace the non-essential residues X in the motif would be within the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

As held by the majority in *Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories, Inc.*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 1989), at 10 USPQ 2d 1846:

That the '813 patent discloses a multitude of effective combinations does not render any particular formulation less obvious. This is especially true because the claimed composition is used for the identical purpose taught by the prior art. See *In re Corkill*, 771 F.2d 1496, 1500, 226 USPQ 1005, 1008 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (obviousness rejection of claims affirmed in light of prior art teaching that "hydrated zeolites will work" in detergent formulations, even though "the inventors selected the zeolites of the claims from among "thousands of compounds"); *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971) (obviousness rejection affirmed where the disclosure of the prior art was "huge, but it undeniably include[d] at least some of the compounds recited in appellants generic claims and it is of a class of chemicals to be used for the same purpose as appellant's additives").

As stated by the Board, for example, Volz describes the correspondent peptide as containing a H-X-H-X-X-C-X-X-C motif. See, e.g., the abstract. Thus, Volz suggests, and Haymore confirms (p. 4, lines 10-13), that the intervening amino acids denominated as "X" are not critical to the metal binding activity of the peptide. In addition, Haymore states that the intervening residues are not important. Therefore, the examiner should consider whether the teachings of Volz and Haymore would have suggested that any naturally-occurring amino acid could be used in the H-X-H-X-X-C-X-X-C motif. This would include the amino acids recited in present claims. Thus the claimed invention is obvious to do since the combined teachings of the prior art would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed compound.

In the absence of any unexpected results or showing as to the criticality of the X residues in the motif, the claimed invention is prima facie obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art at the time the invention was made.